

interactive content generated from the game data extracted from the system at the remote computer.

29. A computer-readable medium having computer-executable instructions for use in performing a method for allowing a remote computer to access an online gaming system, including:

accessing the system with the remote computer;

sending user data and game data from the remote computer to the system, the remote computer being capable of editing the user data and the game data;

applying design rules to the game data to dynamically generate a computer game;

storing the generated computer game on the system; and

associating the generated computer game with a user identifier for providing access to the computer game to the remote computer, wherein the computer game is capable of being played at the remote computer.

30. The computer-readable medium as defined in Claim 29, wherein the computer game is a puzzle.

31. The computer-readable medium as defined in Claim 29, wherein the computer game is a crossword puzzle.

32. The computer-readable medium as defined in Claim 29, wherein the user identifier is capable of being associated with a plurality of generated computer games.

#### REMARKS

In the application claims 14-32 remain pending. Claims 1-13 have been canceled. Claims 14-32 have been added by amendment and find their support in the specification and claims as originally filed. No new matter has been added. None of the pending claims presently

stand allowed. The reconsideration of the rejection of the claims is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claim 3 was rejected as being indefinite and claims 1-13 were rejected as being obvious over Harnett (US 5,605,332). Claim 3 was rejected as being anticipated by Harnett in view of Hibino et al (US 5,599,231). As these rejections may be applied to the claims as added, it is respectfully submitted that the disclosure of Harnett, considered alone or in combination with Hibino, fails to disclose, teach, or suggest the invention that is recited in the claims now at issue. Accordingly, the outstanding rejections must be removed.

In particular, it is submitted that Harnett fails to disclose, teach, or suggest at least the claimed steps of generating a computer game via an online system, playing the computer game on a remote computer and associating the generated computer game with a user identifier. While Harnett discloses in Col. 3, ll. 33-45 a system for displaying and solving an image of a jigsaw puzzle and briefly discusses accessing puzzle data through the Internet, Harnett fails to disclose, teach, or suggest generating a computer game that can be accessed by and played on a remote computer. In fact, except for the reference in passing to the Internet (discussed above), Applicant is unaware of any other reference to or enabling disclosure by Harnett regarding a network system or any means for accessing the Internet. Harnett also fails to disclose, teach or suggest those claim elements that are set forth in the various dependent claims in the subject application.

In addition, it is submitted that Hibino also fails to disclose, teach, or suggest at least the claimed steps of generating a computer game via an online system, storing the computer game on the system and associating the generated computer game with a user identifier. While Hibino discloses in Col. 13, ll. 24-37 a system for transmitting game information via an online

networking system, Hibino fails to disclose, teach, or suggest an online system for generating and storing a computer game and associating the computer game with a user identifier. Hibino also fails to disclose, teach or suggest those claim elements that are set forth in the various dependent claims of the subject application. Accordingly, since the disclosure of Harnett and Hibino fail to anticipate or render obvious the invention set forth in the claims at issue, the rejections must be withdrawn.

### CONCLUSION

The subject application is considered to be in condition for allowance. Such action on the part of the Examiner is respectfully requested. If, however, the Examiner feels that a telephone conference would expedite the allowance of the subject application, the Examiner is requested to contact the attorney undersigned.

While it is not believed that any fees are due, the Commissioner is authorized to charge any fee deficiencies to deposit account number 011,156.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: December 23, 2002

By:



Michael A. Carrillo

Reg. No.44,595

**Altheimer & Gray**

10 South Wacker Drive, Suite 4000

Chicago, Illinois 60606

(312) 715-4000

**Certificate of Mailing:** I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the U.S. Postal Service as First Class mail in an envelope addressed to the Assistant Commissioner for Patents, Washington, DC 20231 on this 23<sup>rd</sup> day of December, 2002.



By   
Name: Debra Leszczynski